<center>REMARKS</center>

For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, are consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 were examined and remain pending. Claims 1-7 and 9-16 stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 13, and 14 have been amended. No additional claims are cancelled. No new claims have been added. No new matter has been added.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 13 and 14 are objected to. As stated in the Office Action, Claim 13 was rejected for the following informalities: "the claim contains the limitation "said frequency of the word", yet in the parent claims, only a "number of occurrences" is being determined." Applicants have amended Claim 13 to correct this informality. Specifically, Claim 13 has been amended to altogether eliminate the use of the phrase "said frequency of the word".

As stated in the Office Action, Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: "The third limitation states "determining whether the word is unnecessary for identifying the given category on the basis of the recognized frequency." Applicants have amended Claim 14 to correct this informality. Specifically, Claim 14 has been amended to change "recognized frequency" to "recognized number of occurrences."

<center>-9-</center>

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 9-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In particular, Claims 1-7, 10-12, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article, "A Machine Learning Approach to Web Mining" by Esposito et al. (hereinafter "Esposito") in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0154181 to Liu et al. (hereinafter "Liu"). Claim 9 is rejected as unpatentable over Esposito in view of Liu and further in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2004/0254911 to Grasso (hereinafter "Grasso"). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esposito in view of Liu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,881 to Mohan (hereinafter "Mohan").

Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 6, 10, and 14 to include the proposed amendment discussed in the aforementioned telephone interview. With regard to Claim 1, the proposed amendment includes the limitation "wherein said unnecessary word determination means determines a word is an unnecessary word in response to the word having a lesser number of occurrences than a given standard in the at least one other category, the given standard comprised of a predetermined threshold scaled by the number of documents in the at least one other category." As discussed and agreed with Examiner Adams and Examiner Truong, the proposed amendment places Claim 1 in condition to overcome all § 102 and § 103 rejections based on the prior art of record including the rejections recited in the Office Action based on Esposito and Lui. Because Applicant has also amended independent Claims 6, 10, and 14 with substantially similar limitations to those recited in the proposed amendment for Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 6, 10, and 14 are also in condition for prompt allowance and request that the rejection of Claims 1, 6, 10, and 14 under § 103 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2-5, 9, 11-13, and 15-16 are also in condition for prompt allowance as depending from allowable Claims 1, 6, 10, and 14.

Additionally, to further capture patentable aspects of the present invention, Applicant has amended Claims 3-4 and 12-13 to include further patentable limitations. Specifically, Claims 3 and 12 have been amended to include the limitation "wherein the document classification catalog is comprised of a plurality of vector spaces wherein each vector space represents at least one

category." And, Claims 4 and 13 have been amended to include the limitation "wherein a target classification document is defined by a document vector and wherein a distance is defined between the document vector and each of the plurality of vector spaces such that the distance indicates a degree of similarity between the target classification document and a category represented by the vector spaces." Applicants respectfully submit that these limitations are not taught in the prior art of record. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 16, ¶ [0039] – page 17, ¶ [0042].

CONCLUSION

As a result of the presented amendments and remarks, Applicant asserts that Claims 1-7 and 9-16 are patentable and in condition for prompt allowance. Should additional information be required regarding the amendment or traversal of the rejections of the independent and dependent claims enumerated above, the Examiner is respectfully asked to notify Applicant of such need. If any impediments to the prompt allowance of the claims can be resolved by a telephone conversation, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

__/David J. McKenzie/____

David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicant

Date:_October 4, 2007_
Kunzler & Associates
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
Telephone (801) 994-4646
Fax (801) 531-1929